

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

KHALID O. RAHMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

PIERCE COUNTY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C06-5262 RBL/KLS

ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR  
RULE 26(f) HEARING

This civil rights action has been referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge pursuant to Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local MJR 3 and 4. Before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for a Rule 26(f) hearing. Pursuant to Rule 26(f), parties must confer to develop a discovery plan *except* for those parties exempted from initial disclosures under Rule 26(a)(1)(E). Pursuant to Rule 26(a)(1)(E)(iii), an action brought without counsel by a person in custody is one such category exempted from disclosure and thus, exempted from Rule 26(f)'s obligation of a discovery conference.

Now that some of the Defendants have filed their Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint in this case, the Court finds that issuance of a pretrial scheduling order is appropriate. The order will address the conduct of discovery and the filing of dispositive motions and joint status report.

ORDER - 1

1 Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for a Rule 26(f) hearing (Dkt. # 10) shall be **DENIED**. A  
2 pretrial schedule order shall issue separately.

3  
4 DATED this 5th day of April, 2007.

5  
6  
7   
8 Karen L. Strombom  
9 United States Magistrate Judge  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27